



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/729,613	12/04/2003	Arvid M. Thompson	687.02	1309

7590 12/11/2008  
DERGOSITS & NOAH LLP  
Attn: Andrew B. Schwaab  
Suite 1450  
Four Embarcadero Center  
San Francisco, CA 94111

EXAMINER
----------

CHAPMAN, JEANETTE E

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3633

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

12/11/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/729,613

**Applicant(s)**

THOMPSEN, ARVID M.

**Examiner**

Jeanette E. Chapman

**Art Unit**

3633

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 July 2008.  
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.  
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 and 8-12 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) 3 and 4 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  
5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.  
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-2, 5-6, 8-12 is/are rejected.  
7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.  
8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).  
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)  
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application  
6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

Applicant is reminded that claims 3-4 have been withdrawn. See amended claims of 4/25/07.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2, 5-6, 8-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Becker 2806492) in view of Sutter (4593893) and Satori et al (5584217) and Bonnet (6189702).

Becker discloses method of trimming a planar object plate 4 comprising:

- applying a decorating pattern, that includes an alignment line 15 to the planar object 4; the type of decorative pattern being a laminate is not critical to the method; other patterns could be applied without effecting the method; applicant has not shown that this laminate is critical and relevant to the method. Many different patterns may be applied to object while still using the recited method
- positioning the planar object 4 on a trimming table device, shown figures 5-7, wherein the trimming table device comprises a base 10, an alignment edge 6, an

reader 7b/d and a movable saw 11;

- moving the planar object 4 over the table until an edge of the planar object 4 abuts the alignment edge 6;
- trimming the planar object with the movable saw 11 while the table is held stationary.

Becker moves the object using a different method in order for the reader to locate the alignment line. The recited method step is not seen as critical to the invention. Moving the table over the base until the optical reader locates the alignment line is an optional method of advancing the workpiece or planar object; one of ordinary skill in the art would have appreciated all of the known methods and would have selected any known method commensurate with the process; Bonnet discloses moving the adjustment table 12/15 over the base 40/19 with the servo motor 42 controlled by the optical reader 204. It would have been obvious to have the servo motor that is controlled by the optical reader to provide accurate handling of object as taught by bonnet

Becker discloses securing the object 4 to the table prior to trimming the object by the feeding mechanism

Becker the table and the first saw 11 are movably coupled to the base 10 and the alignment edge.

Becker discloses the trimming of the planar object is performed by displacing a cutting saw relative to the planar object

Becker discloses moving the adjustment includes actuating a motor that is coupled to the adjustment table 10. It is obvious and inherent that in order to run the movable saw the same is performed and coupled to a motor in order to function. Additional saws function also by motors coupled thereto.

Becker discloses the trimming of the planar object includes displacing the saw along an edge of the planar object.

It would be obvious trim the second edge by moving the workpiece along the table or to add an additional saw to cut additional edges. Sutter discloses several saws and motors needed to perform more than one cutting operation. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Becker to include as many saws and motors as needed perform additional cutting an trimming operation as shown by Sutter.

Becker lacks the optical reader as that shown by Sutter. It would have been obvious to employ the optical reader of Sutter in order to form a more accurate and precise cut to the work piece

Becker does not employ securing the planar object to the adjustment table with a plurality of suction discs. The securing method has been considered a matter of choice. One of ordinary skill in the art would have appreciated using any known method of securing the work piece or planar object. The method of suction disc has not been considered critical to the method of the invention.

Becker lacks the adjustment table and this table secured to the trimming table. Sartori et al discloses a method of trimming an object. The adjustment table 20 is secured to the cutting table 21. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Becker to include the adjustment table and to secure it to the cutting/trimming table in order to precisely and accurately position the work piece in relation to the saw and stand 20/21 of Becker as shown by Sartori et al.

Applicant is reminded that claims 3-4 have been withdrawn. See amended claims of 4/25/07.

Applicant's arguments are moot in view of the new ground of rejection.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chapman E. Jeanette whose telephone number is 571-272-6841. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-thursday, 8:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, BRIAN GLESSNER can be reached on 571-272-6843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/JEANETTE CHAPMAN/  
PRIMARY EXAMINER  
ART UNIT 3633

Application/Control Number: 10/729,613  
Art Unit: 3633

Page 7